

SOLOMON E. GRESEN [SBN: 164783]
STEVEN V. RHEUBAN [SBN: 48538]
LAW OFFICES OF RHEUBAN & GRESEN
15910 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 1610
ENCINO, CALIFORNIA 91436
TELEPHONE: (818) 815-2727
FACSIMILE: (818) 815-2737

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Omar Rodriguez, Steve Karagiosian,
Cindy Guillen-Gomez, Elfego Rodriguez and Jamal Childs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

OMAR RODRIGUEZ; CINDY GUILLEN-
GOMEZ; STEVE KARAGIOSIAN;
ELFEGO RODRIGUEZ; AND JAMAL
CHILDS,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

BURBANK POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY
OF BURBANK; AND DOES 1 THROUGH
100, INCLUSIVE.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: BC 414 602

Complaint Filed: May 28, 2009

Assigned to: Hon. Joanne B. O'Donnell, Judge

**NOTICE OF ERRATA RE FILING OF
TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF
AUTHORITIES TO PLAINTIFF'S
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
SUMMARY ADJUDICATION OF ISSUES
AGAINST PLAINTIFF ELFEGO
RODRIGUEZ**

DATE: May 12, 2010
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
DEPT.: 37

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that counsel for Plaintiff, ELFEGO RODRIGUEZ, inadvertently failed to attach the Table of Contents and Table of Authorities to his Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, which is scheduled to be heard on May 12, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 37 of the above-referenced Court located at 111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, California.

//

//

Therefore, attached hereto as Exhibit A is the Table of Contents and Table of Authorities for Plaintiff's "Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative, Summary Adjudication of Issues Against Plaintiff Elfego Rodriguez."

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: April 29, 2010

LAW OFFICES OF RHEUBAN & GRESEN

By: Robert C. Hayden
Robert C. Hayden, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff, Elfego Rodriguez

EXHIBIT A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. <u>SUMMARY OF FACTS</u>	1
1. Field Training Officer	1
2. Special Response Team	2
3. Special Enforcement Detail	2
Chief Stehr Wanted to Retaliate Against Plaintiff	4
Plaintiff Complained About Racist Comments Displayed on White Board.	5
After Chief Stehr Learned of the White Board Complaint, He Disbanded SED	5
In Retaliation, the Department Seeks to Terminate and Humiliate Every Officer Who Complained About Discrimination, Including Plaintiff.	6
II. <u>ROLE OF COURT IN SUMMARY JUDGMENT PROCEEDINGS</u>	7
III. <u>TRIABLE ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT EXIST AS TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF THE FEHA BASED ON GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 12940 (a) (DISCRIMINATION)</u>	7
A. <u>Disparate Treatment - Prima Facie Case</u>	8
B. <u>Disparate Treatment - Purported Non-Discriminatory Reason and Pretext</u>	10
C. <u>FEHA Violation Proven by Disparate Impact</u>	12
IV. <u>TRIABLE ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT EXIST AS TO PLAINTIFF'S SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR HARASSMENT</u>	14
V. <u>TRIABLE ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT EXIST AS TO PLAINTIFF'S THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WRONGFUL RETALIATION</u>	18
A. <u>Prima Facie Case</u>	18
B. <u>Purported Non-Retaliatory Reasons and Pretext</u>	19

1 VI. TRIABLE ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT EXIST AS TO PLAINTIFF’S FIFTH CAUSE
2 OF ACTION TO TAKE REASONABLE STEPS TO PREVENT HARASSMENT AND
3 DISCRIMINATION 20
4

5 VII. TRIABLE ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT EXIST WITH RESPECT TO THE SIXTH
6 CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF POBRA 20
7

8 VIII. CONCLUSION 20
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Aguilar v. Avis Rent A Car Sys. (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 121, 145	<u>15</u>
Alch v. Superior Court (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1412, 1428	<u>13</u>
Arauz v. Gerhardt (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 937	<u>7</u>
Beyda v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 65 Cal.App.4th 511	<u>15</u>
Black v. Sullivan (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 557	<u>7</u>
Cucuzza v. City of Santa Clara (2002) 104 Cal. App.4th 1031, 1038	<u>10, 11</u>
Dee v. Vintage Petroleum, Inc. (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 30, 36-37	<u>16</u>
Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hospital (1984) 214 Cal. App. 3d 590, 610.	<u>14, 15, 17, 18</u>
Flait v. North American Watch Co., (1992) 3 Cal.App.4th 467, 477	<u>18</u>
Frank v. County of Los Angeles (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 805, 817	<u>12</u>
Gray v. Reeves (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 567	<u>7</u>
Guz v. Bechtel National, Inc. (2000) 24 Cal.4th 317, 354, fn. 20	<u>7-10, 12</u>
Hale v. George A. Hormel & Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 73	<u>7</u>
Hanson v. Lucky Stores, (1999) 74 Cal. App.4th 215, 224	<u>10, 12</u>
Heard v. Lockheed Missiles & Space Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 1735, 1755	<u>13, 14</u>
Horn v. Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App.4th 798, 807	<u>10-12</u>
Horsford v. Board of Trustees of Calif. State Univ. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4 th 359, 373	<u>8</u>
Keene v. Wiggins (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 308	<u>7</u>
Mariani-Colon v. Department of Homeland Security ex rel. Chertoff (1 st Cir. 2007) 511 F.3d 216, 224	<u>19</u>
McGinest v. GTE Serv. Corp. (9 th Cir. 2004) 360 F.3d 1103, 1122 n.32	<u>9</u>
Miller v. Department of Corrections (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 446, 462	<u>15</u>
Mixon v. Fair Employment and Housing Com. (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 1306, 1317	<u>7, 9</u>
Mokler v. County of Orange (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 121, 138.	<u>18</u>
Nazir v. United Airlines, Inc. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 243, 270	<u>17</u>
Northrop Grumman Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1021, 1036	<u>20</u>

1	Obrey v. Johnson, 400 F.3d at p. 695	13
2	Passantino v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Products, Inc. (9 th Cir. 2000) 212 F.3d 493, 507 ..	19
3	Perez v. County of Santa Clara (2003) 111 Cal. App.4th 671, 677.	10
4	Sada v. Robert F. Kennedy Medical Center (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 138, 148	7
5	Schnidrig v. Columbia Machine (9 th Cir. 1996) 80 F.3d 1406, 1410	7
6	State Dept. Of Health Services v. Sup. Ct. (McGinness) (2003) 31 Cal.4th 1026, 1042	16
7	Weil & Brown, CAL. PRAC. GUIDE: CIV. PRO. BEFORE TRIAL (Rutter 2009) , para.7:830.5	
8	at 7-136	19
9	Wysinger v. Automobile Club of So. Calif. (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 413, 421	18
10	Yanowitz v. L'Oreal USA, Inc., (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1028, 1058	17
11	Yanowitz v. L'Oreal USA (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1028, 1050-1052	8

Statutes

13	Government Code Section 12940	7, 8, 20
14	Government Code §3300, et seq.	20

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

3 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of eighteen and am not a
4 party to the within action. My business address is 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1610, Encino,
California 91436.

5 On April 29, 2010, I served a copy of the following document described as **NOTICE OF**
6 **ERRATA RE FILING OF TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF AUTHORITIES TO**
7 **PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO**
8 **DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION** on the interested parties in this
9 action as follows:

10 Lawrence A. Michaels
11 Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP
12 11377 West Olympic Boulevard
13 Los Angeles, CA 90064-1683
14 Facsimile: (310) 312-3100
15 Email: LAM@musk.com

Linda Miller Savitt, Esq.
Ballard Rosenberg Golper & Savitt, LLP
500 North Brand Boulevard, Twentieth Floor
Glendale, California 91203
Facsimile: (818) 506-4827
Email: lsavitt@brgslaw.com

11 Carol Ann Humiston
12 Senior Assistant City Attorney
13 Office of the City Attorney
14 275 East Olive Avenue,
15 Burbank, California 91510-6459
16 Facsimile: (818) 238-5724
17 Email: chumiston@ci.burbank.ca.us

Kristin A. Pelletier, Esq.
Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP
444 South Flower Street, Suite 2400
Los Angeles, California 90071
Facsimile: (213) 236-2700
Email: kpelletier@bwslaw.com

16 XX **BY MAIL:** By placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed
17 as above, and placing each for collection and mailing on that date following ordinary
18 business practices. I am "readily familiar" with this business's practice for collecting
19 and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is
placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with
the U.S. mail Postal Service in Los Angeles, California, in a sealed envelope with
postage fully prepaid.

20 XX **BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION:** Based on a court order or an
21 agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused
22 the documents to be sent to the person(s) at the e-mail address listed above. My
23 electronic notification address is ag@rglawyers.com. I did not receive, within a
reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that
the transmission was unsuccessful. A copy of the electronic transmission showing the
time of service is attached.

24 XX **STATE:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that
25 the above is true and correct.

26 EXECUTED on April 29, 2010, at Encino, California.

27 _____
Annette Goldstein